

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

DUANE ZIEMBA
Plaintiff

v.

JOHN ARMSTRONG, ET AL
Defendants

:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CIVIL ACTION NO.
3-01-cv-2166 (JCH)

OCTOBER 7, 2005

RULING

Defendants, Armstrong, Myers and McAllister have moved this court to enter judgment in their favor on all claims asserted by the plaintiff against them. The court, by Ruling dated March 28, 2005, granted these defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment with respect to the claims against them. However, the court denied the defendant, DeGray's, Motion for Summary Judgment, and thus the claim against DeGray remains pending in this case.

The movants do not state in their Motion any reason upon which the court would grant their Motion other than its Ruling on the summary judgment motion. Rule 54 grants to the district court discretion to enter a partial judgment under certain circumstances. Here, all the claims against certain defendants have been determined in this multi-defendant case. However, the movants have failed to present any basis upon which the court would exercise its discretion with respect to the required finding that there is "no just reason for delay." Fed.R.Civ.P. 54(b). Given the strong federal policy against piecemeal appeals, and in the absence of any showing by the moving defendants that there is a reason for a partial entry of judgment, let alone the absence of a showing that no just reason for delay exists, the court denies the defendants' Motion. See Wright, Miller & Kane, Federal Practice and Procedure: Civil Third § 2659

at 109-110 (1998). Absent such showing, the Motion is denied.

SO ORDERED.

Dated at Bridgeport, Connecticut this 7th day of October, 2005.

/s/ Janet C. Hall
Janet C. Hall
United States District Judge